

# **EXHIBIT 10**

1

CITY OF SEATAC CITY COUNCIL MEETING

2

OCTOBER 25, 2016

3

4

5

6

TRANSCRIPT OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING REGARDING  
FIRS MOBILE HOME PARK

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

**CERTIFIED COPY**

20

21

22

23

24

Transcribed by:

25 Andie Evered, CCR

1 Video transcription 10/25/2016  
2

3 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: Good evening SeaTac City  
4 council members and everyone in the audience. I, Monica  
5 Mendoza-Castrejon, from the Tenants Union of Washington on  
6 behalf of the Firs Home Owners Association am here to say  
7 that the families want to stay in their homes and keep  
8 their families rooted in SeaTac.

9 We understand that you are making legislative  
10 priorities and that you are appreciating us. But, that is  
11 not enough. We are currently in a crisis. And tonight,  
12 during new business, we are requesting for you to extend  
13 the appeal process so that families can work with legal  
14 processes and have sufficient time to do so; the amount of  
15 time that they have been given is simply not enough. We  
16 are also asking for several things from all of you.

17 The second thing I want to bring up is that if  
18 the families were to leave, it would have a tremendous  
19 impact on the schools of SeaTac and the money generated  
20 from students attending the schools. If the students who  
21 live in the Firs Homes leave, this creates a detriment on  
22 this behalf.

23 Thirdly, there was a resounding voice amongst the  
24 tenants. They know that SeaTac is their home, not the  
25 hotels which John Park wants to build and displace the



1 families. Having the families here brings tremendous help  
2 towards your beautiful, diverse community which so many  
3 people love about SeaTac.

4 The kids, hearing about them having to move are  
5 scared, worried and cry often given how they fear that  
6 they might have to leave. They want to stay in their  
7 homes that they are in right now.

8 City council members, this is your decision. It  
9 is an enormous opportunity for you all to join a regional  
10 conversation around affordable housing, as well as nearly  
11 every mayor in South King County has agreed to join a task  
12 force and speak about affordable housing.

13 I have also spoken to many levels of government.  
14 Statewide legislators, King County Council members,  
15 including Dave Upthegrove as well as Larry Gossett, whom  
16 are offering tremendous support for the families.

17 I also have a -- written support from King County  
18 Council member Larry Gossett with me. And, their message  
19 was clear. This decision rests on your hands, the city  
20 council. You have the power to decide the future of these  
21 families. It is a huge responsibility. We know there are  
22 alternatives. But, we ask that you also meet with us to  
23 explore any opportunity that there may be.

24 There is growing pressure in South King County to  
25 consider how the economy and our communities are changing.



1 The same (unintelligible) approach to our city life is not  
2 enough. This is a community. The City Council, as I've  
3 mentioned, is responsible for fostering community and not  
4 just collecting taxes. We have a vision for a better  
5 SeaTac. And, it is served by homes, not hotels. We are  
6 asking for justice. And, the families in the Firs  
7 Homeowners Association all have a resounding voice, that  
8 they want to say that this is their home and they want the  
9 opportunity to continue to be a part of this beautiful  
10 community.

11 Again, I ask that you all, during new business,  
12 extend the appeal process. In addition, we ask that you  
13 meet with us to explore the alternatives that are  
14 available to us as a city. Thank you.

15 MR. SIEFKES: Patsy Wehr?

16 MS. WEHR: Good evening, council members. Thank  
17 you for giving us your time this evening. My name is  
18 Patsy Wehr and I have been a resident of the Firs Mobile  
19 Home Park in SeaTac for over 45 years. On May 9th the  
20 residents received a letter from relocation committee  
21 stating that the mobile home park would close in June of  
22 2017.

23 Our park has many families with children  
24 attending Madrona Elementary, located across the street,  
25 and in middle and high schools in the Highline District.



1 We have elderly and disabled residents on fixed incomes.  
2 We chose mobile homes because we couldn't afford  
3 conventional housing. Many came to our country to give  
4 their families a better chance in life.

5 In 1996 Kathryn Hillman, the previous owner,  
6 tried to get the park zoned commercial. She came from  
7 Montana to dine with members of the planning department  
8 and city council members. She sent letters, dripping with  
9 honey, trying to convince them to change the zoning to all  
10 commercial. The City Council declined her request and  
11 kept our park residential. She was required by Washington  
12 State laws to offer each resident the opportunity to  
13 purchase our space and then form an association. The law  
14 stated that 60 percent of residents needed to agree. She  
15 totally ignored this requirement. And, at this point, she  
16 is not happy with the city council so she sold the park to  
17 foreign investors.

18 Most of these homes cannot be relocated because  
19 of HUD codes. There are those living in single-wide homes  
20 are offered up to \$7,000, only to have them demolished,  
21 costs \$8,000. I have contacted four mobile home parks and  
22 none have any spaces available.

23 We were informed, through a SEPA report, the  
24 owners are planning to build two hotels and an apartment  
25 complex. We are tax-paying citizens of SeaTac. We shop



1 and work locally and contribute our share. We love living  
2 in the city. We are being forced out of our homes because  
3 of some money hungry investors. We were told some space  
4 is available in Kitsap and Clark counties. Many of our  
5 residents are related and don't want to be separated.  
6 Where are we going to go?

7 I worked for Highline School District for 15  
8 years, 13 at Madrona Elementary. I've seen how it affects  
9 children starting a new school. Lack of attention, loss  
10 of sleep, low appetite, a new teacher, loss of school  
11 friends and depression. It becomes a major challenge in  
12 their young lives. You see the agony in their little  
13 faces.

14 On July 29th we had a fire that left three homes  
15 destroyed, displacing these families but forced them to  
16 keep paying their monthly space rent. All of their  
17 possessions, destroyed. Forced to relocate. The children  
18 had to change schools. All the while, our owner resides  
19 in a home valued at \$835,000.

20 MR. SIEFKES: All right. I'm sorry. Your time's  
21 up.

22 MS. WEHR: Anything you can do would please would  
23 be greatly appreciated. And, thank you so much for your  
24 time this evening.

25 MR. SIEFKES: Thank you, Patsy.



1 Martha Zamora?

2 (Interpreted from Spanish to English)

3 (By Ms. Mendoza-Castrejon)

4 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: Hello and good evening.

5 My name is Martha Zamora and I am a member of the  
6 Firs Mobile Home Community. We are a community of 72  
7 families. And, for an injustice, we are at risk of being  
8 homeless. Just a very, very short time ago, with  
9 something that they put on our homes, without letting us  
10 know, they said that for one year they're going to close  
11 the park and we're going to lose all of our homes.

12 Many people, including myself, bought these homes  
13 and we've made many fixes that will make it impossible to  
14 move. This will not only destroy our community but also  
15 our homes. They're going to demolish the 72 homes, that  
16 with so much sacrifice and care, we'd attended to.  
17 Instead of these homes, they're going to create  
18 development, they're going to create hotels, which is on  
19 behalf of development and not for ourselves. And for  
20 ourselves, they are only offering \$2,000 to move, each of  
21 us. We know that this will not even reach the amount to  
22 move to a new apartment. We come here not only for your  
23 help so that we can stay here, but to hear opportunities.  
24 A community that has stayed here for even up to 50 years.  
25 We have talked to many forms of government, statewide,





1 countywide, that have said that this is your opportunity  
2 to help us. Thank you.

3 MR. SIEFKES: Thank you. Irene Cruz?

4 (Interpreted from Spanish to English by Ms.  
5 Mendoza-Castrejon)

6 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: As you all know, I am  
7 here for the same cause. I am here asking for all of you,  
8 as elected officials, that you hear with your hearts,  
9 especially on myself as a mother. We're asking, please  
10 listen, because they are going to destroy our homes. I am  
11 asking, please, don't do it not only for ourselves as  
12 adults but for our kids. Our kids who also go to schools,  
13 our children who have a bright future and want to stay  
14 here in the city of SeaTac. Thank you.

15 (Break in audio)

16 MS. CASTRONOVER: Hi, my name is Laura  
17 Castronver. I'm from 1319 South 251St, Des Moines. And,  
18 I'm here -- freedom of speech -- in regards to the bond  
19 that's on our ballot --

20 MR. SIEFKES: I'm sorry. We have to follow state  
21 law. So, if you're going to go ahead and explain that  
22 you're against the bond, we can't do that here. It's just  
23 against the rules.

24 MS. CASTRONOVER: Okay. I'm against the bond.  
25 And, like I said, we've talked to the other councils,



1 Burien, Des Moines, and was not told no, we couldn't talk.

2 MR. SIEFKES: Thank you, Laura.

3 MS. CASTRONOVER: I'm sorry. Where's our freedom  
4 of speech?

5 MR. SIEFKES: Again, we just have rules we have  
6 to follow. And, thank you.

7 All right. That's the last person that signed up  
8 for public comments tonight, so we'll move on.

9 We're on to item number 7, key city issues, by  
10 acting city manager Joseph Scorcio.

11 MR. SCORCIO: The last item on my list tonight  
12 was to talk about the mobile home park appeal. So, I  
13 think I'll just move that one to the front of the list.

14 I've been keeping you apprised of the process  
15 that's been going on and I wanted to give you a couple of  
16 updates tonight. And, I think this -- this is what the  
17 folks that are here tonight are trying to get at.

18 So, as I mentioned, the last couple of meetings,  
19 we have been reviewing the relocation plan in accordance  
20 with the City requirements for that. Our city  
21 requirements are a mirror of state law that requires  
22 certain processes to be met. In the case of -- in this  
23 particular case, the City, in reviewing it, also required  
24 that the relocation plan be translated to Spanish because  
25 there are so many Spanish speakers in residence. That was



1 done. That was approved. All of the rest of the plan was  
2 approved on Monday October 17th, and notices were provided  
3 to the property owners and the homeowners at that time.

4 In accordance with the city code, and I believe  
5 consistent with state law, there is a 14-day appeal  
6 period, which we are in the middle of, and it ends on  
7 October 31st, next Monday. That appeal goes to the city  
8 hearing examiner. This is not a matter that statutorily  
9 comes to the city council. And, that's why -- I've know  
10 I've said this at prior meetings, this is an issue. If it  
11 is appealed, it goes to the hearing examiner for review of  
12 compliance of the plan with the statute.

13 The other thing that came up in the conversation,  
14 and I wanted to clarify because this is very important,  
15 park owners -- mobile home park owners are required to  
16 provide at least 12 months advanced notice of closure to  
17 all their tenants. And, there is a formal process for  
18 this that has to be filed through the state. And, in our  
19 last conversation, which was October 17th, with the  
20 representatives of the state, this formal notice has not  
21 yet been filed. So, there was reference to a notice  
22 having been provided earlier, that the closure was going  
23 to be next June, I think was the statement.

24 Again, the state law requires a 12 month formal  
25 notice. And, that notice had not been filed with the



1 state, to our knowledge as of October 17th. So, we are  
2 following the process to the letter. We are trying to  
3 make sure that everything is done in accordance with the  
4 requirements of city standards. And, normally I don't,  
5 but I think this is probably a good one for me to stop and  
6 ask if the council members have any questions about this  
7 particular matter that I can try to answer?

8 MR. SIEFKES: Absolutely. Katherine actually  
9 asked first.

10 MS. CAMPBELL: My only question is, does this  
11 council have any legal authority to prevent the sale of  
12 the property by the person that owns it?

13 MR. SCORCIO: None that we are aware of, because  
14 it is a private property matter and state law has specific  
15 processes for mobile home park closures. The city does  
16 not have a role -- the city council particularly does not  
17 have a role in the closures of mobile home parks.

18 MR. SIEFKES: I understand that.

19 I'm sure somebody will take care of translating  
20 that for me. Would you do that for me, please?

21 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: We will let them know.

22 MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.

23 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: And, actually, we would  
24 like to follow up with everyone because we've been in  
25 discussion with a lot of people as I mentioned



1 (unintelligible) --

2 (Crosstalk)

3 MR. SIEFKES: If you're going to engage that, we  
4 need to get her. But again, I want to -- I want to  
5 stress, very clearly, opinions -- opinions of other  
6 parties relative to the city's responsibilities are their  
7 opinions. We've been following this absolutely by the  
8 letter of city code.

9 I'm not trying to get in the way of this but I  
10 want to assure you that our city code is very clear on  
11 what our responsibilities are and we've been adhering to  
12 that. And, the city council does not play a role in the  
13 review of these closure plans. That's the way it has been  
14 laid out. So, we're not trying to be, in any way,  
15 contrary. But, I wanted to make sure that the facts were  
16 clear.

17 Tony?

18 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, one of the questions that  
19 they asked, or a request that they made of -- some of the  
20 speakers made to us is to extend the comment period. Now,  
21 you know, this thing -- this, obviously, has significant  
22 impact on our community. Lots of kids are affected by  
23 this. This is the first time, in my memory, that we've  
24 had this come up. So, this is something new that we  
25 should give it the time it deserves. I mean questions



1 have come up from other mobile home parks. Some folks at  
2 Bow Lake, some folks at Angle Lake, they're concerned that  
3 this thing is going -- could -- they could be next on the  
4 list. And, you know, they're concerned that this could  
5 happen to them too. So, we need to do the right thing and  
6 give it a thorough vetting. Is there any way, we as a  
7 council or as a city, can -- can extend the comment  
8 period? A lot of people are asking questions. And,  
9 again, we need to get it right.

10 MR. SIEFKES: I'm going to have Mark address that  
11 in part. But, again, I want to follow up. The city has  
12 code that we are required to review the closure plan by.  
13 We are then required to provide notice, which we have  
14 done, to the individual park owners. And -- and it  
15 establishes, by statute, a 14-day appeal period. So,  
16 we're well within that. That is, again, only an appeal of  
17 our review of the documents that have been in front of us.  
18 This has nothing to do with the State's review and the  
19 State's ultimate decision whether to authorize the  
20 closure. So, again, we're -- we're marching down,  
21 following the path, and trying to provide every  
22 opportunity possible. And, I'm going to turn it over to  
23 Mark to --

24 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. I may have missed -- asked  
25 the wrong question here. I was under the impression that



1 it was a comment period. But it's the appeal period?

2 MR. SIEFKES: That is correct.

3 MR. ANDERSON: And the appeal has already been  
4 sent so it's --

5 MR. SIEFKES: They can file an appeal that would  
6 go to our hearing examiner to review our administrative  
7 review and approval of the closure plan.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. If they don't get together  
9 within the two-week period, is there a way we could extend  
10 the appeal period? Because we -- obviously some language  
11 barriers here. And, again, this is our first crack at  
12 this thing. Are we stuck with a two-week period?

13 MR. JOHNSEN: Yes, I think they are. And the  
14 reason why, the appeal process is set forth in our  
15 municipal code. And, when the property owner went -- you  
16 know, started this process, he or she -- I don't know if  
17 it's a he or a she -- but the property owner is following  
18 what our code is. It would be unfair for, coming just as  
19 a matter of fairness, to change code in mid process. This  
20 is actually part of our zoning code as well. And so I am,  
21 you know, fairly certain that the issue investing would  
22 also come up and they would be best to that code. So, for  
23 a couple of reasons that I can think of right now, and  
24 there's there might be others, I don't believe that that  
25 is something that we can change.





1 MR. SIEFKES: All right. Pam?

2 MS. FERNALD: Joe, did you want to say something  
3 else?

4 MR. SIEFKES: Waiting for questions.

5 MS. FERNALD: Okay. Well, so, what I'd like to  
6 say is that I don't think there's a person up here that  
7 doesn't understand what's happening and does not have --  
8 what word do I want to use -- well, compassion. It's even  
9 more than compassion -- is not broken-hearted that people  
10 will be displaced. But, what I want to make clear, and  
11 I've said this to guys when it came to the town meeting as  
12 well, you know, I think -- I think you're getting some bad  
13 information, some bad advice. And so I -- I respectfully  
14 request that you wouldn't come here and say it is up to us  
15 when we know, we all know, it's not up to us. We don't  
16 have any legal recourse. If we did, we'd be doing it.  
17 So, if somebody is telling you that, I mean we can't break  
18 the law. We can't break our law. We can't just change  
19 something on a whim at the last minute to fit what's going  
20 on. And, so, maybe I'm not expressing it correctly, but  
21 all I'm saying to you is, you know, with your signs and  
22 things, we get it but there's nothing we can do. And, I  
23 think we mentioned before, that to go to the legislature  
24 and state laws that could be changed. And, I know, for a  
25 fact, that staff here has done everything they -- do you





1 want -- could you wait until I'm finished?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)

3 MR. SIEFKES: You don't get a respond. It's our  
4 turn, sorry.

5 (Crosstalk)

6 MS. FERNALD: I know that our staff has worked  
7 diligently within all the rules that we've got and the  
8 laws trying to find a way -- I know that the county has  
9 because I've seen you at -- some of you at our county  
10 meeting where I was. And, I requested that they reach out  
11 and find out what could be done to help you. So, we're  
12 working within our laws.

13 So, please I -- make this clear. I don't want  
14 anybody out there to think that we are letting them down.  
15 It's not up to us at this point. So, I'm so sorry. You  
16 know, if it was the other way -- if it was flip flopping  
17 and you guys wanted to do something with your own private  
18 property, and the other person would come here and say  
19 they're trying to kick us off of our property -- You know,  
20 it works both ways for anybody. So, you know, we have to  
21 go by the law.

22 MR. SIEFKES: All right. Rick?

23 MR. FORSCHLER: So, the official notice hasn't  
24 been given yet; is that right?

25 MR. SCORCIO: The official notice required at the



1 state level. The State has not received the plan nor have  
2 they issued the one-year closure for --

3 MR. FORSCHLER: So the clock still hasn't  
4 started.

5 MR. SCORCIO: The clock has not started.

6 (Crosstalk)

7 MR. FORSCHLER: -- for one year?

8 MR. SCORCIO: Right.

9 MR. FORSCHLER: Okay. And the appeals period, is  
10 that after the clock starts?

11 MR. SCORCIO: The appeal period is for our  
12 decision, having reviewed the plan, having then allowed  
13 the plan to move forward.

14 MR. FORSCHLER: But has that even started since  
15 the official notice hasn't been given?

16 MR. SCORCIO: Yes.

17 MR. FORSCHLER: Okay.

18 MR. SCORCIO: Yeah. It's two separate clocks.

19 MR. FORSCHLER: Okay.

20 MR. SCORCIO: Our action -- the City of SeaTac  
21 made a conscious decision some years ago to impose a  
22 review of closure plans for mobile home parks.

23 It's -- our requirements are stricter than state  
24 law. If we had not, council prior -- some council prior  
25 to this decided to add this in, if they had not done that,



1 we wouldn't have a role in this closure at all. The fact  
2 that we do, and the fact that we have gone through the  
3 steps in that to make sure that the closure plan was  
4 translated, distributed, the notices have been provided,  
5 the clock, for our purposes, starts when the decision was  
6 reached. That they hadn't dotted all the I's and cross  
7 all their T's, that can be appealed to the hearing  
8 examiner and the hearing examiner is empowered to double  
9 check our work, essentially. That's the nature of the  
10 appeal. But, they still have to go through the entire  
11 state process. They still have to go through those of  
12 that official twelve month clock in which we are not a  
13 party.

14 MR. FORSCHLER: So, is someone going to make it  
15 known to the hearing examiner that that clock hasn't  
16 started yet?

17 MR. SCORCIO: Yes. We would obviously be -- if  
18 an appeal is filed, will be presenting why we think it  
19 meets city requirements. But, we're also going to make  
20 sure that all the facts that we have been gathering on  
21 this case are presented as well.

22 MR. FORSCHLER: So this will be, this next  
23 question, I guess, would be for Mark or you. Do either of  
24 you know other -- other cities? It's my impression that  
25 SeaTac kind of goes above and beyond already what other



1 cities have required for mobile home closures.

2 MR. SCORCIO: We've done a bit about that and  
3 apparently Mark (unintelligible) City of Seattle is the  
4 only other jurisdiction that has specific local standards  
5 in our immediate area, SeaTac and Seattle.

6 Mark, do you want to amplify?

7 MR. JOHNSEN: No, I think that's my understanding  
8 as well. I haven't obviously researched every -- and I  
9 don't think staff has -- every city in the state. But,  
10 we're unique. I think -- I think that's a very safe  
11 statement.

12 MR. FORSCHLER: You're doing more than most do?

13 MR. JOHNSEN: That's correct. And as Joe  
14 indicated, we would not be -- if we didn't have a code in  
15 place to review the plan, our review would be very  
16 limited, if much at all.

17 MR. FORSCHLER: Thank you.

18 MR. JOHNSEN: So, that's why we're going through  
19 this process.

20 MR. SIEFKES: All right. Peter?

21 MR. KWON: Let's go back to zoning real quick.  
22 So, I'm looking at our city zoning map and it looks like  
23 that property, and the IHOP that's by it and that entire  
24 strip in fact, is commonly zoned CDC, community  
25 (unintelligible) center, which is the exact same zoning



1 all the way up and down International Boulevard. I mean  
2 that -- the entire strip is the same community, zoning  
3 center. I'm wondering, how long had it been zoned this  
4 way? Do we know? We didn't change the zoning. It's been  
5 like that, I'm assuming?

6 MR. JOHNSEN: I don't have a -- I don't have it  
7 at my fingertips, but it has been zoned that way for a  
8 very long time. And, we can certainly -- we can certainly  
9 check on that. But, there's no change in recent history  
10 that has occurred. This is has been outstanding from the  
11 city. And, I think the comprehensive plan designation for  
12 this area goes back to 1994 for the same thing, supporting  
13 commercial. So, I'd expect the zoning would as well, at  
14 least back that far.

15 MR. KWON: So this is potentially back to when  
16 the city first incorporated if zoning on International  
17 Boulevard hasn't changed?

18 MR. JOHNSEN: Very likely, yeah.

19 MR. KWON: Okay.

20 MR. SIEFKES: All right. So, the only thing I'd  
21 say is, if everybody sitting up here wanted to keep you in  
22 your homes, and we all voted to keep you in your homes, we  
23 couldn't keep you in your homes. It's not under our  
24 authority to do so. If anybody is telling you it is under  
25 our authority to help you stay in your homes, they're not



1 telling you the truth. This is governed by state law.  
2 The only person in this room that has any ability to help  
3 you is councilman -- or representative Mia Gregersen. So,  
4 if she's not helping you, you know, then that's the only  
5 person here that can help you. All right. Tony?

6 MR. ANDERSON: Well, yeah. Actually I got like  
7 three questions. First off, in this (unintelligible) --  
8 could the hearing examiner extend the appeal period if --  
9 if they -- if they brought an appeal to the hearing  
10 examiner and say, because of the complexity of this issue,  
11 present it to the hearing examiner and the hearing  
12 examiner says yes, this is complex. We can push this out.

13 MR. SIEFKES: The answer to that is no. You  
14 can't extend the appeal period, in my opinion. But, would  
15 he -- you know, obviously, his deliberations of these  
16 issues, if it was a -- with the complexities, et cetera,  
17 if he needed, you know, additional time to render a  
18 decision, he has the authority in that regard.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Is there a time between the  
20 when the one-year period starts and the hearing -- the  
21 appeal meeting with the hearing examiner? I mean they're  
22 not -- they're unrelated; right?

23 MR. SIEFKES: Yes. And I can't -- I don't have  
24 the answer to that specific question. I can't give you an  
25 answer on that.



1 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. There's been a lot of  
2 information on this thing bouncing around in the media,  
3 and apparently -- and I've been just getting the periphery  
4 of it -- Bellevue, didn't they have a similar issue to  
5 this and Bellevue came up with some kind of  
6 (unintelligible) resolution? Are you familiar with that  
7 at all?

8 MR. SIEFKES: I am not. I don't know if Joe is  
9 or anybody else is. But, I'm not aware of anything in  
10 Bellevue.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Pam heard something about  
12 it. What do you think about it, Joe?

13 MR. SCORCIO: Oh, I'm not -- well, again not  
14 addressing what Bellevue may or may not have done and all  
15 the circumstances, I don't know.

16 Bellevue also has a housing program in which they  
17 may have been able to intercede. That started, in the  
18 back of my mind, a recollection of what -- what occurred  
19 in that -- in that case. But in terms of statutory  
20 authority, we have -- we have our stuff in place. And, as  
21 Mark pointed out, this is a -- this is an application that  
22 is in process. And, you cannot change the rules on an  
23 application once it's in process. It vests. So, we have  
24 to process the review of the closure plan, as we have  
25 done, according to what's on the books today.



1           And, I do, I think, want to echo and clarify a  
2   little bit about Mark's comments in response to your  
3   question. Once an appeal is filed, then the materials can  
4   be provided to the examiner. Then the questions can be  
5   raised about whether we complied, we the city complied, in  
6   our review of it. It is not -- the hearing examiner would  
7   not be deciding whether or not a park can close or not.  
8   It's only whether or not the closure plan meets the  
9   requirements established. I want to be very clear about  
10   that. We have a very limited and well-defined role in the  
11   process. The State controls the actual closure -- closure  
12   plan decision.

13           MS. FERNALD: And so, do you -- this wasn't going  
14   to be my question but it is now.

15           So, part of the -- I haven't seen the closure  
16   plan. Is one of the elements of the closure plan how  
17   tenants are going to be reimbursed?

18           MR. SCORCIO: Yes.

19           MS. FERNALD: And -- okay. And that's all a part  
20   of the state piece, I know.

21           MR. SCORCIO: Yes.

22           MS. FERNALD: Okay. So, that's part of the  
23   closure plan. Okay. So, what I was -- my original  
24   question was going to be something to the effect of rather  
25   than sit here and onsie, twosie, give you the -- bless you





1 -- third degree, maybe -- I just -- I guess I want to say  
2 I feel -- I feel confident that the City has done, and is  
3 doing, whatever they can legally and responsibly do in  
4 this situation. And if I say that, that's correct; right?  
5 I mean that we're not holding back. We're not trying to  
6 pull any -- we're not trying to trick anybody. We're just  
7 doing everything we can. I know we are -- to help.

8 MR. SCORCIO: In my view, we are doing absolutely  
9 everything we can do. And, I think as I've mentioned, we  
10 went to extraordinary measures to make sure that the plan  
11 was translated and verified, that it was accurately  
12 translated to what we had approved in English language,  
13 what we are -- we are familiar with, and we went that  
14 extra distance. I think we have done everything we can,  
15 and we are not stepping beyond our authorities. I want to  
16 assure you of that as well. We are -- we are doing what  
17 we can do.

18 MS. FERNALD: So if anything comes up, you know,  
19 based on some of the items that Tony brought up for  
20 example, if, during the rest of this time, anything comes  
21 to our attention that, you know, there's a loophole or  
22 anything comes up that we could do something, we would;  
23 right? I mean legally.

24 MR. SCORCIO: Yes. I mean we always -- we always  
25 adhere strictly to the requirements that are in the -- in



1 the code, and we're documenting, we're being accurate,  
2 we're making sure. Because if -- if anything we've done  
3 is helpful along the way, to either the residents or the  
4 property owners, we want to make sure everything's done  
5 properly. We don't want to make any mistakes along the  
6 way. And, we certainly don't want to be viewed, in either  
7 case, as being impartial to the law. The law is what has  
8 been established. So, I think we are -- with high  
9 confidence, I'm saying we're doing everything we can and  
10 reasonably should do.

11 MS. MENDOZA-CASTREJON: Thank you.

12 MR. SIEFKES: Thanks. Rick, final?

13 MR. FORSCHLER: Thank you. Yeah, just real  
14 quick. So, Joe, part of our legislative agenda, it says  
15 SeaTac supports increased funding to ensure adequate  
16 relocation assistance for displaced residents of  
17 redeveloped mobile home parks and legislation that  
18 provides greater rights to mobile home tenants.

19 So, that's on our legislative agenda for next  
20 year.

21 MR. SCORCIO: Assuming our lobbying efforts are  
22 successful and we get the state legislature to change  
23 something, because the clock has not started yet on that,  
24 would there be time for that law to go into place and have  
25 some benefit to these folks, or do we know?



1 MR. FORSCHLER: Well, we don't know for sure.

2 But, I would -- I would say that there is a likelihood of  
3 some improvement.

4 (End of requested portion of video)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1

CERTIFICATION

2

3

I, Andie Evered, do here by declare

4

under penalty of perjury under the laws of the

5

State of Washington that the following is true and

6

correct

7

1. That I am an authorized

8

transcriptionist;

9

2. This transcript is a true and correct

10

record of the proceedings to the best of my

11

ability.

12

3. I am in no way related to or employed

13

by any party in this matter; and

14

4. I have no financial interest in the

15

litigation.

16

Dated in Bend, Oregon, this 1st day of

17

June, 2020.

18



19

Andie Evered, CCR

20

State of Washington CCR #2393

21

22

23

24

25

